UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,160	08/01/2006	Hanneke Boerstoel	128879	4210
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 11/03/200 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3208	50	EDWARDS, NEWTON O		
ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22320-4850		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/588,160	BOERSTOEL E	T AL.
Examiner initiated interview dammary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	N. EDWARDS	1794	
All Participants:	Status of Application:		
(1) <u>N. EDWARDS</u> .	(3)		
(2) Mathew Barthalow(60,323).	(4)		
Date of Interview: 23 October 2008	Time:		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)		
Part I. Rejection(s) discussed:			
Rejections of record.			
Claims discussed: Claims of record			
Prior art documents discussed: Art of record.			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of tinterview, since	he substance
/N Edwards/ Primary Examiner			
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if	appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Primary Exminaer called Applicant before a Final rejction to say claims 1, 2, 3, and 5 are allowable per Applicants amendment and arguments. Unamended claim 12 is still rejected on the art for record for reasons of record. Also the Primary Examiner included two references with the first action which showed the term fiber included yarn and multifialment fiber as stated in the rejection. Applicant had no response.